

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
WESTERN DIVISION

LATRELL ADAMS

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:08cv154(DCB)(MTP)

JACQUELINE BANKS, SANDRA JACKSON,
LAWRENCE WALTON, AND BRYAN SHUCKROW

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

This cause is before the Court on various motions filed by the plaintiff. Having considered the motions and responses, where filed, and being fully advised in the premises, the Court finds and orders as follows:

The plaintiff objects to Magistrate Judge Parker's discovery order (docket entry 47) requiring the defendants to produce a summary of RVR's issued to inmates at WCCF for violating the smoking policies from September 2007 to present. Adams contends that he needs the names of the inmates and their POD numbers, but he has not shown why he needs this information. The plaintiff's motion to amend/correct order (**docket entry 62**) is therefore DENIED, and the plaintiff's motion for ruling (**docket entry 89**) is DENIED AS MOOT.

The plaintiff objects to Magistrate Judge Parker's discovery order (docket entry 86) requiring the defendants to produce all ARP's and lawsuits filed by inmates complaining about secondhand smoke from September 2007 to present. Adams objects that he needs information prior to September 2007; however, that is the relevant

time period according to the allegations of his complaint. The plaintiff's motion for review of magistrate judge's order (**docket entry 129**) is therefore DENIED.

Adams also seeks review of Magistrate Parker's Order (docket entry 86) denying his motion to add the Mississippi Department of Corrections and Corrections Corporation of America as defendants. In its September 18, 2008, Scheduling and Case Management Order, entered following the omnibus hearing, the magistrate judge stated that no further amendments to the pleadings would be allowed absent a showing of good cause. The plaintiff has failed to show good cause; therefore, his motion for review of magistrate judge's order (**docket entry 130**) is DENIED. Since the Court has ruled on his motion, the plaintiff's motion for the Court to consider out-of-time motion (**docket entry 133**) and motion to amend docket entry 133 (**docket entry 150**) are MOOT.

The plaintiff objects to the magistrate judge's order denying his motion to extend the motion filing deadline another two months. The plaintiff does not set forth any compelling reason to extend the deadline and his motion for review (**docket entry 131**) is therefore DENIED.

The plaintiff seeks review of Magistrate Judge Parker's Order (docket entry 117) on various motions. The Order denies Adams' motion for additional discovery, after allowing discovery following the omnibus hearing, and after granting further discovery requests

to the plaintiff. The plaintiff does not show that the additional discovery he seeks could not have been obtained according to the discovery schedule ordered by Judge Parker, and indeed some of the information he seeks has already been obtained. The plaintiff does not show a compelling need for a security videotape of his housing unit. He also fails to show the need for a court-appointed expert. Finally, the plaintiff has failed to show good cause for his failure to amend his pleadings in accordance with the Court's scheduling order. In fact, the plaintiff has already amended his complaint twice and is not entitled to amend yet again. Accordingly, the Court orders that the plaintiff's Objection to Court's Order on Motions (**docket entry 149**) is DENIED.

The plaintiff objects to Magistrate Judge Parker's denial of his request for court-appointed counsel. Plaintiff is not entitled to court-appointed counsel and his Objection (**docket entry 166**) is DENIED.

The plaintiff's Motion for Ruling on Motions seeks a ruling on various motions before the undersigned and before Magistrate Judge Parker. Inasmuch as all pending motions have been ruled on by the undersigned or by Magistrate Judge Parker, the plaintiff's motion (**docket entry 190**) is DENIED AS MOOT.

SO ORDERED, this the 30th day of September, 2009.

/s/ David Bramlette
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE